REMARKS

Claims 1 - 7 were pending and under consideration.

In the Office Action, Claims 1 - 7 were rejected.

In this Amendment, Claims 1 - 7, the title, and Fig. 10D are amended. No new matter has been introduced as a result of this amendment.

Accordingly, Claims 1- 7 are at issue.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 102 Anticipation Rejection of Claims

Claims 1 - 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Prasad et al (hereafter "Prasad") (U.S. Patent Number 5,956,718). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 is directed to a transmitting apparatus for transmitting a hierarchical structure of a directory for hierarchically managing locations of contents data. The transmitting apparatus comprises a managing unit, a detecting unit, and a transmitting unit.

As amended, Claim 1 recites that the position information includes a schema version, with the schema version being a value that changes correspondingly to a change to the hierarchical structure of the directory. That is, the position information includes a value that represents the number of changes to the hierarchical structure of the directory.

Prasad states that:

"Distinguished Name or DN is a representation of the sequence of hierarchical components. An NDS object is identified by its name and by the names of the objects in which it is contained, in a hierarchical tree structure. The object's own name is called its partial name, or RDN (for Relative Distinguished Name). Proceeding up the hierarchy, each containin object has its own RDN. For # example, CN = Jan. O = Acme. C = US has three partial names (RDNs). The Common Name is "Jan." The Organization Name is "Acme." And, the Country Name "US. This request is addressed to the server holding the master replica of the destination container. The new parent of the NDS object is identified by Destination Parent Entry ID. Within that container, its relative distinguished name will be New RDN. The client also identifies the server holding the master replica of the existing entry, by sending the Source Server's DN."

(See Column 6, lines 1 – 20), and that:

"The source server makes a Restore Entry request to the destination server to transfer the complete object information. This can take several iterations. If there is a temporary anomaly, this step is retried several times before completing or being abandoned. The structure of the Restore Entry NDS Protocol verb is provided in Table 3."

(See Column 6, lines 60 -65), and further that:

"The transmitter constructs a list of names that the receiver may know the entry by. This list acts as a hint for the receiver in locating the correct entry. Once the correct entry has been located processing can resume normally. If no moves are in progress for any component in the name path for the object then the list will consist of only one name, which is the current state of the entry.

The receiver tries to locate the entry by processing each of the names in the list. Once a match has been found the entry is identified and the rest of the names in the name list may be ignored. Preferably, the receiver will not create a reference for an entry it has not seen unless explicitly requested by the transmitter. Therefore, the issue of collapsing a reference object with the real object when the move completes may not arise.

The following functions can be used for are used to build a list of names for a specified entry. An entry is a complete object identifier. It is constructed by starting with the relative identifier of an object and adding the relative identifier of each ancestor object until the relative identifier of the root of the object hierarchy is added. All parameters are called by value and the called routine may modify the values in any way."

(See Column 15, lines 5- 25).

Thus, Prasad does teach about obtaining position information and identification information as they relate to container entry and leaf entry, respectively. However, Prasad fails to teach or disclose that the position information includes a value that represents the number of changes to the hierarchical structure of the directory.

Accordingly, Claim 1 is allowable over Prasad, as is dependent Claim 2 for at least the same reasons.

Each one of the amended Claims 3 – 7 recites a distinguishable limitation analogous to that of Claim 1. Thus, Claims 3 – 7 are also allowable over Prasad for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that these claim rejections under U.S.C. § 102 be withdrawn.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that Claims 1 – 16 are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 22, 2006 By: _____

David R. Metzger
Registration No. 32,919
SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000